W

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/036,181	YI ET AL.	
Notice of Allowability	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gentle E. Winter	1746	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appearance All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIOT of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313	(OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this app or other appropriate communication IGHTS. This application is subject to	lication. If not included will be mailed in due course. THIS	ive
1.  This communication is responsive to <u>Amendment and rem</u>	arks submitted 1/26/04.		
2. The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-4, 6, 8-10 (renumbered as 1-	<u>8)</u> .		
3. $\square$ The drawings filed on <u>28 December 2001</u> are accepted by	the Examiner.		
<ul> <li>4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority unall All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:</li> <li>1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have</li> </ul>			
<ol><li>Certified copies of the priority documents have</li></ol>	• •		
<ol><li>Copies of the certified copies of the priority do</li></ol>	cuments have been received in this	national stage application from the	
International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
* Certified copies not received:			
Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONN THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.		complying with the requirements	
5. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be subminFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which give			
6. CORRECTED DRAWINGS ( as "replacement sheets") must	st be submitted.		
(a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( PTO-948) attached			
1)  hereto or 2)  to Paper No./Mail Date			
(b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner' Paper No./Mail Date	s Amendment / Comment or in the C	ffice action of	
Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1 each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in t	.84(c)) should be written on the drawing the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(	ngs in the front (not the back) of	
7. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT			
Attachment(s)  1. Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	5. ☐ Notice of Informal P	atent Application (PTO-152)	
2. ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	6.  Interview Summary Paper No./Mail Date	(PTO-413),	
3. Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No./Mail Date			
4. Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit	8. X Examiner's Stateme	ent of Reasons for Allowance	
of Biological Material	9.  Other		

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant argues that the rejection fails to take into account two significant structural limitations recited in claim 1. Specifically, (1) "said water flow field being dead ended in the region of the corresponding one of said reactant gas inlet manifolds." And (2) "a flow restrictor at the exhaust end" of the water flow field.
- 2. Applicant then argues that the prior art fails to disclose that the product water comes through the porous layer and is expelled. What is not clear, in the prior art of record is that the porous coolant plate corresponds to the "dead end". Based on the remarks it appears that dead end means many smaller openings along a path, forming the input and a single output. For the forgoing, the remarks are persuasive with respect to the "dead end" argument advanced by applicant.
- 3. The second point, related to a flow restrictor at the "exhaust end" is not apparently disclosed by Collins either. Collins does disclose a pressure control means and even discloses the disclosed pressure gradient. However, the pressure gradient in the Collins reference shows that the pressure of the coolant is lower than that of the reactants (to minimize the entrance of antifreeze into the fuel system).
- 4. For the forgoing reasons the rejections are withdrawn.

Application/Control Number: 10/036,181

Art Unit: 1746

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102--Withdrawn

1. Claims 1-4, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,322,915 to Collins et al., hereinafter Collins. Applicant's credible arguments have distinguished the instant application from the prior art of record.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103--Withdrawn

- 1. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins and PGPub 20020106546 A1 to Perry et al. "Perry".
- 2. The arguments drawn to Collins, and addressed above, remove Collins as a reference.
- 3. Claims 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins and United States Patent No. 6,503,298 to Monzyk et al. The arguments drawn to Collins, and addressed above, remove Collins as a reference.

### Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claims 1-4, 6, and 8-10, renumbered as 1-8 are allowed.
- 5. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:
- 6. Applicants' arguments are deemed credible in their assertion that rejection fails to take into account two significant structural limitations recited in claim 1. Specifically, (1) "said water

Application/Control Number: 10/036,181

Art Unit: 1746

flow field being dead ended in the region of the corresponding one of said reactant gas inlet manifolds." And (2) "a flow restrictor at the exhaust end" of the water flow field.

- 7. Applicant then argues that the prior art fails to disclose that the product water comes through the porous layer and is expelled. What is not clear, in the prior art of record is that the porous coolant plate corresponds to the "dead end". Based on the remarks it appears that dead end means many smaller openings along a path, forming the input and a single output. For the forgoing, the remarks are persuasive with respect to the "dead end" argument advanced by applicant.
- 8. The second point, related to a flow restrictor at the "exhaust end" is not apparently disclosed by Collins either. Collins does disclose a pressure control means and even discloses the disclosed pressure gradient. However, the pressure gradient in the Collins reference shows that the pressure of the coolant is lower than that of the reactants (to minimize the entrance of antifreeze into the fuel system).
- 9. For the forgoing reasons the rejections are withdrawn.
- 10. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Art Unit: 1746

#### Conclusion

- 11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gentle E. Winter whose telephone number is (571) 272-1310. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-3:30.
- 12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy P. Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.
- 13. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 273-1310.

Gentle E. Winter Examiner Art Unit 1746

March 12, 2004

RANDY GULAKOWSKI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700